



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/960,325	09/24/2001	Mari Uenishi	KOS0012-US	5336
27510	7590	09/30/2003	EXAMINER	
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP 607 14TH STREET, N.W. SUITE 900 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			WRIGHT, WILLIAM G	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1754		

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/960,325	UENISHI ET AL.
	Examiner William G. Wright SR.	Art Unit 1754

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit 1754

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by EP 1,053,779A1.

Note the claims of the reference. Applicants argue that the amended claims overcome the '779 anticipation rejection.

Applicants' position that Example 1 of the specification shows palladium on alumina, as the instant claims now do is well received. Also the applicants' position that Example 3 of the instant specification teaches a first layer of palladium and zirconium complex is well received. This argument is not persuasive as the instant amended "comprising" claims teach palladium with heat resistant alumina and other permitted components. The '779 reference teaches that the heat resistant inorganic oxide may be alumina at paragraph [0018] where alumina is taught to be "particularly useful". The teaching of a two

Art Unit 1754

layer structure is found at paragraph [0029] where a multilayer catalytic coating is found to include a first layer of palladium with alumina and a second layer of platinum with rhodium on a zirconium complex which contains cerium as well.

The applicant's stated position as to the Table and Example 3 of the instant application and embodiment 6 of the applied reference with the differences of the applied reference is noted. The instant amended claims do not differ in their composition from the applied art. Any arguments over performance must first be to a composition that differs from the instant claims.

The anticipation rejection over '507 is overcome.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered

Art Unit 1754

therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 1,013,334A1.

The instant invention is obvious from the composition teachings found in EP 1,013,334A1. The claims teach a catalytic coating composition comprising zirconium complex oxide, cerium complex oxide, noble metals and alkaline earth metals. The utility being the same for the references and the instant claims, it would be obvious to arrive at the instant claimed invention from the teachings of the reference.

The applicants argue the obviousness rejection over EP '334 as failing to disclose or suggest the compositions where rhodium or platinum are supported on a zirconium complex oxide. Also platinum is supported on a cerium complex oxide, EP '334 teaches at paragraphs [0014-0016] the use of a platinum, rhodium and palladium on alumina. The catalytically active substance may be

Art Unit 1754

supported selectively on the particles of the inorganic oxide before the oxide is coated onto the support. Note paragraphs [0014-0017] for these teachings. The teachings of the zirconium complex oxide are found at line 1 of EP '334. The above paragraphs teach rhodium or platinum supported on a zirconium complex oxide at paragraph [0016].

The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obviousness-type or non-obviousness-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and *In re Goodman*, 29 USPQ 2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78(d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-11 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of copending application Serial No. 09/902,570. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they overlap in scope of subject matter claimed.

Art Unit 1754

This is a *provisional* obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The applicants argue that the ODP rejection over Serial No. 09/902,570 is overcome by the amendments to the outstanding instant claim 1. The arguments to instant claim 1 requiring claimed layered structure in the presence of alumina and noble metals. Serial No. 09/902,570 teaches at claim 9 the presence of a noble metal in a further formed layer is added to the coating layer.

The applicants argue that the ODP rejection over Serial No. 09/902,570 is overcome by the amendment to the outstanding instant claim 1. The amendments to instant claim 1 requiring claimed layered structure in the presence of alumina and noble metals. Serial No. 09/902,570 teaches at claim 9 the presence of a noble metal in a further formed layer is added to the coating layer.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). The practice of automatically extending the shortened statutory

Art Unit 1754

period an additional month upon the filing of a timely first response to a final rejection has been discontinued by the Office. See 1021 TMOG 35.

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William G. Wright, Sr. whose telephone number is (703) 305-7792. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 6:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman, can be reached on (703) 308-3837. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are

Serial No. 09/960,325

-8-

Art Unit 1754

(703) 872-9306 for the regular communications and (703) 872-9311
for after final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of
this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group
receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1495.

WGW
W. G. Wright, Sr.:cdc

September 26, 2003

SJB
STEVEN BOS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1100